

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/030,451

REMARKS

This amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 31, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 remain pending in the application with claims 22-23 being deemed allowable over the art of record but objected to for depending on rejected base claims. The Examiner has also objected to claims 1, 7 and 12 for containing informalities.

Claim amendments set forth above are believed to obviate the objections.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fejer. Claims 1, 9-10, 12, 19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne. Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view Ortiz and Kato. Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view of Petisce and Yamada. Claims 4 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view of Petisce, Yamada and Tausch. Claims 5 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view of Petisce, Yamada and Akerman. Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view of Petisce. Claims 7, 11 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view of Akerman. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and further in view of Petisce, Tausch and

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/030,451

Field. Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne and Field. Claims 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kruishoop in view of Osborne in view of Petisce, Yamada and Field.

To expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant amends claims 1 and 12 to include the allowable subject matter in claims 22 and 23, respectively. Applicant submits that all the pending rejections are traversed in view of the amendment.

Applicant further adds claims 24-25 to describe the linear disposition and alignment of the claimed elements. The art of record does not teach such an arrangement. For example, to the extent Fejer teaches the individual elements, the concave element is disposed offset at an angle from the source and expander, for example. To the extent Kruishoop teaches or suggests individual elements, the elements are disposed in a folded arrangement, and Osborne lacks a concave element disposed on an opposite side of the target fiber and the linear arrangement as claimed in claims 24-25.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 1-22 and 24-25 are in condition for allowance. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the subject application be passed to issue at the earliest possible time. The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/030,451

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan Peng Dan
Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 29, 2005